

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, and 14 remain in this application with claims 1 and 10 in independent form. Claims 1, 7, 10, and 14 have been amended and claims 3 and 13 have been cancelled. There is full support in the specification as originally filed for the amendments and no new matter is believed to be added.

Applicant thanks Examiner Pich for his time to conduct a telephonic interview on November 29, 2005 to discuss the subject invention. Even though an agreement was not reached, Applicant appreciates the insight provided by Examiner Pich. In response to the interview, Applicant submits the subject amendment incorporating the proposed amendments as discussed accompanied by a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.114.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Curtis et al. (United States Patent No. 5,963,599) and claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Curtis et al. in view of Meier (United States Patent No. 5,673,031).

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to more clearly define the subject invention. Specifically, claims 1 and 10 recite that the second electronic device **12** transmits a radio frequency RF signal **50** that includes user information to identify the user **16**. After the RF signal **50** is detected, user privileges for the user **16** are retrieved from a user database. The first electronic devices **18** are enabled based upon the user privileges in addition to the detection of signal from the second electronic device **12**.

Referring to claim 1, the first electronic device **18** is then enabled in response to the access point **20** detecting the RF signals **48**, **50** from both the first **18** and the second electronic devices **12** and based upon the user privileges. Said another way, if the user

**Appln. No.: 09/997,299**

**Amdt. dated December 7, 2005**

**Reply to Office action of September 9, 2005**

privileges for the user exclude certain first electronic devices 18, then those first electronic device may remain disabled even if the signal strength is above the predetermined threshold. Once the first electronic device is enabled, the user 16 is allowed to access the first electronic device 18 and to access the network 13.

The first electronic device 18 is disabled in response to either one of the signal 48, 50 strengths from the first electronic device 18 and the second electronic devices 12 being measured below the predetermined threshold by the access point 20. The first electronic device 18 is re-enabled in response to the access point 20 detecting the RF signals 48, 50 from both the first 18 and the second electronic devices 12 above the predetermined threshold and based upon the user privileges. As the user 16 moves about the working space, such as away from the first electronic device 18 and away from the access point 20, the signal strength from the second electronic device 12 drops below the predetermined threshold. In order to create a secure environment, the first electronic device 18 disables and prevents unauthorized access thereto. As the user 16 re-enters the working space and moves close enough to the access point 20 such that the signal strength is above the predetermined threshold, the first electronic devices 18 become re-enabled to allow access thereto.

Referring to claim 10, after retrieving the user privileges, a predetermined number of first electronic devices 18 are enabled in response to the detected RF signal 50 strength being above the predetermined threshold at either the first or second access points 21, 23 or both and based upon the user privileges. Data from the second electronic device 12 is transmitted through the access point 20 that measures the maximum RF signal 50 strength to the predetermined number of first electronic devices 18 thereby establishing communication between the first electronic devices 18 and the second electronic device

**Appln. No.: 09/997,299**

**Amdt. dated December 7, 2005**

**Reply to Office action of September 9, 2005**

12. In other words, the communication between the first and the second electronic devices **18, 12** is routed through the access point **20** instead of directly between the first and the second electronic devices **18, 12**.

The first electronic devices **18** are disabled in response to the RF signal **50** strength from the second electronic device **12** being measured below the predetermined threshold at both the first and second access points **21, 23** to prevent access to the network **13** and the first electronic device **18**. The predetermined number of first electronic devices **18** are re-enabled in response to the detected RF signal **50** strength being above the predetermined threshold by either of the first and second access points **21, 23** and based upon the user privileges. By communicating through the access points, the authorization of the user **16** is able to move as the user **16** moves about the working space. If the signal detected by the first access point **21** drops below the threshold, but the signal strength detected by the second access point **23** remains above the threshold, then the predetermined number of first electronic devices **18** remain enabled for the user **16**. Said differently, the user **16** is able to access the first electronic devices **18** as the user **16** moves within the working space.

Claims 1 and 10, as amended, overcome the rejections and are therefore believed to be allowable. Claims 2, 4-9, 11-12, and 14, which depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 10, are also believed to be allowable.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Application, as amended, is now presented in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully solicited. Applicant believes that no fees are due, however, if any become required, the Commissioner is

**Appln. No.: 09/997,299**

**Amdt. dated December 7, 2005**

**Reply to Office action of September 9, 2005**

hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit


Account 08-2789.

Respectfully submitted

**HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.**

December 7, 2005

Date



**Kristopher K. Hulliberger, Reg. No. 53,047**

The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite #101

39400 Woodward Avenue

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304

(248) 723-0453


**Appln. No.: 09/997,299**

**Amdt. dated December 7, 2005**

**Reply to Office action of September 9, 2005**

**CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAIL**

I hereby certify that the enclosed **Amendment** being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee", Mailing Label No. **EV564944911US** and addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on **December 7, 2005**.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Anne L. Kubit

KKH/alk